

EXHIBIT A

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6596

Claimant: ELM PLAZA,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was actually in the building.

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6597

Claimant:WASHINGTON GAS & LIGHT,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was actually in the building.

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6599

Claimant:THE MAXWELL CONVENTION CENTER,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was actually in the building.

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they do not refer or relate to efforts to remove, contain and/or abate any Grace asbestos-containing product.

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6600

Claimant:NAUGATUCK VALLEY MALL,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was actually in the building.

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6601

Claimant:PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF JAMESBURG,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they do not refer or relate to efforts to remove, contain and/or abate a Grace asbestos-containing product.

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6602

Claimant:CONGREGATION B NAI JEHOSHUA BETH ELOHIM,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they do not refer or relate to efforts to remove, contain and/or abate any Grace asbestos-containing product.

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6603

Claimant:TOWER PROPERTIES,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to refer or relate to the abatement or removal of a Grace product that presumably occurred in connection with "multiple renovations" performed after January 1988 when, at the latest the claimant learned of the presence of asbestos-containing material. See responses to Question 10 and Question 11 and 1988 Asbestos Assessment Survey.

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to include building air sample results.

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6604

Claimant:AT&T BUILDING - COUNTRY CLUB TOWERS,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was actually in the building.

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6606

Claimant:EPISCOPAL CHURCH CENTER,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was actually in the building.

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

the doocument fails to provide abatement cost information and fails to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was removed, contained and/or abated.

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6608

Claimant:BENDER HYGIENIC LABORATORY,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was actually in the building.

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6609

Claimant:WYTHE COUNTY COMMUNITY HOSPITAL,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was actually in the building.

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was removed, contained and/or abated.

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6610

Claimant:CARILION ROANOKE MEMORIAL HOSPITAL,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they do not refer or relate to efforts to remove, contain and/or abate any Grace asbestos-containing product.

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6611

Claimant:ST. PAUL S LUTHERAN CHURCH, FELLOWSHIP H

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to provide abatement cost information and fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was removed, contained and/or abated.

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6612

Claimant:CALDOR DEPARTMENT STORE,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was actually in the building.

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was removed, contained and/or abated.

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6613

Claimant:HARTFORD NATIONAL BANK CORPORATE SERVICE CTR,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was actually in the building.

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they do not refer or relate to efforts to remove, contain and/or abate any Grace asbestos-containing product.

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6616

Claimant:60 BOARD STREET BUILDING,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they do not refer or relate to efforts to remove, contain and/or abate any Grace asbestos-containing product.

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6618

Claimant:104 CORPORATE PARK DRIVE,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was actually in the building.

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6619

Claimant:COMSAT LABORATORIES & PENTHOUSES,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they do not refer or relate to efforts to remove, contain and/or abate any Grace asbestos-containing product.

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6620

Claimant:HARTFORD HOSPITAL MAIN BLDG & WINGS A E,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was removed, contained and/or abated.

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6621

Claimant:HINTZ ROAD PARTNERSHIP,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was removed, contained and/or abated.

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results, other than from abatement samples, were not included.

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6622

Claimant:HINTZ ROAD PARTNERSHIP,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments: Same attachments as claim 6621

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was removed, contained and/or abated.

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results, other than from abatement samples, were not included.

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6623

Claimant:HINTZ ROAD PARTNERSHIP,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments: Same attachments used for Claims 6621 and 6622.

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was removed, contained and/or abated.

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results, other than from abatement samples, were not included.

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6624

Claimant:CLARA MAASS MEDICAL CENTER,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was actually in the building.

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was removed, contained and/or abated.

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6625

Claimant:CALIFORNIA MART LLC,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was actually in the building.

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was removed, contained and/or abated.

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6626

Claimant:EXXON RESEARCH & ENGINEERING-TOWER,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was actually in the building.

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimants first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was removed, contained and/or abated.

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6629

Claimant:ST CHARLES HOSPITAL & REHABILITATION CEN,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was actually in the building.

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6633

Claimant: TEMPLE ISRAEL,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was actually in the building.

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was removed, contained and/or abated.

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6634

Claimant:THE CLEVELAND MUSEUM OF ART,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6636

Claimant:F F THOMPSON CONTINUING CARE CENTER INC,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6637

Claimant:GULF ATLANTIC PROPERTIES INC BAYVIEW TOW,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was actually in the building.

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was removed, contained and/or abated.

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6638

Claimant:THE EQUITABLE BUILDING,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was actually in the building.

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they do not refer or relate to (i) abatements that occurred prior to 1997, as referred to in the attached documents, or (ii) efforts to remove, contain and/or abate any Grace asbestos-containing product.

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6639

Claimant:EDEN MEDICAL CENTER,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was actually in the building.

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6640

Claimant:EXXON RESEARCH & ENGINEERING -BLDG. FP 1,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was actually in the building.

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was removed, contained and/or abated.

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6682

Claimant:RUTLEDGE TOWER,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6753

Claimant:BULLOCH MEMORIAL HOSPITAL,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was actually in the building.

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was removed, contained and/or abated.

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6756

Claimant:WASHINGTON GAS & LIGHT,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was actually in the building.

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was removed, contained and/or abated.

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6766

Claimant:MAY DEPARTMENT STORE COMPANY,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was actually in the building.

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:STEINMEYER, AMANDA G

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:6893

Claimant: 10 HANOVER SQUARE BUILDING,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was actually in the building.

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:SPEIGHTS, DANIEL A

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:9838

Claimant:THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was actually in the building.

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:SPEIGHTS, DANIEL A

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:9839

Claimant:THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was actually in the building.

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:SPEIGHTS, DANIEL A

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:9840

Claimant:REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:SPEIGHTS, DANIEL A

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:9841

Claimant:REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:SPEIGHTS, DANIEL A

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:9842

Claimant:THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was actually in the building.

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:SPEIGHTS, DANIEL A

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:9843

Claimant:REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was actually in the building.

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:SPEIGHTS, DANIEL A

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:9844

Claimant:REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:SPEIGHTS, DANIEL A

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:9845

Claimant:REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was actually in the building.

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:SPEIGHTS, DANIEL A

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:9846

Claimant:REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:SPEIGHTS, DANIEL A

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:9847

Claimant:REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:SPEIGHTS, DANIEL A

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:9848

Claimant:REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:SPEIGHTS, DANIEL A

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:9849

Claimant:REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was actually in the building.

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:SPEIGHTS, DANIEL A

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:9850

Claimant:REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:SPEIGHTS, DANIEL A

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:9851

Claimant:REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:SPEIGHTS, DANIEL A

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:9852

Claimant:REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:SPEIGHTS, DANIEL A

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:9853

Claimant:REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was actually in the building.

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:SPEIGHTS, DANIEL A

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:9854

Claimant:REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:SPEIGHTS, DANIEL A

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:9855

Claimant:REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:SPEIGHTS, DANIEL A

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:9856

Claimant:REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:SPEIGHTS, DANIEL A

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:9857

Claimant:REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:SPEIGHTS, DANIEL A

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:9858

Claimant:REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:SPEIGHTS, DANIEL A

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:9859

Claimant:REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:SPEIGHTS, DANIEL A

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:9860

Claimant:REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:SPEIGHTS, DANIEL A

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:9861

Claimant:REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was actually in the building.

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:SPEIGHTS, DANIEL A

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:9862

Claimant:REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:SPEIGHTS, DANIEL A

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:9863

Claimant:REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:SPEIGHTS, DANIEL A

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:9864

Claimant:REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to demonstrate that a Grace asbestos-containing product was actually in the building.

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:SPEIGHTS, DANIEL A

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:9865

Claimant:REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:SPEIGHTS, DANIEL A

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:9866

Claimant:REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:SPEIGHTS, DANIEL A

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:9867

Claimant:REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.

Attorney:SPEIGHTS, DANIEL A

Law Firm:SPEIGHTS & RUNYAN

Claim Number:9868

Claimant:REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,

As described below, certain questions on the Asbestos Property Damage Proof of Claim Form require the claimant to provide documents. On the Claim Form identified above, the following checked questions were not answered or were not responded to properly, for the reason(s) stated:

Category 1 Claim: Category 1 Comments:

16. Documents relating to the purchase and/or installation of the product in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

18. Documents concerning when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

they fail to indicate either expressly or from the nature or context of the document, when the claimant first knew of the presence of asbestos in the property.

22. Documents concerning efforts to remove, contain and/or abate the Grace product.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

26. Documents concerning testing or sampling for asbestos in the property.

No documents were provided.

Documents provided are insufficient because:

building air sample results were not included.